



3 2044 097 640 775

182
947

92

This BRIEF is issued for the PRESS and
for a few friends and college students.

It is composed only of the introductions
to sections of a more complete and annotat-
ed work now being prepared.

WHICH ROAD to PERMANENT PEACE

by

BROWN LANDONE

I—A TALKING LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Which Has Attempted to Substitute
Phonographs for a World Police
or

II—A FEDERAL UNION

Which Proposes to Keep Robbers
Away by Strewing Millions of \$1,000
Bills on Our Front Lawns
or

III—A SUPER STATE

Which Shall Have Power to Act Only
as a World Police to Enforce Perma-
nent Peace on Earth

*A definite contrast to all past
and presently proposed plans of
federations or unions or leagues of
nations whose mode of operation
is talk.*

182
947

HD

LAW
LIBRARY



HARVARD LAW SCHOOL
LIBRARY

182
947

(92)

This BRIEF is issued for the PRESS and for a few friends and college students.

It is composed only of the introductions to sections of a more complete and annotated work now being prepared.

WHICH ROAD to PERMANENT PEACE

by

BROWN LANDONE

I—A TALKING LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Which Has Attempted to Substitute
Phonographs for a World Police
or

II—A FEDERAL UNION

Which Proposes to Keep Robbers
Away by Strewing Millions of \$1,000
Bills on Our Front Lawns
or

III—A SUPER STATE

Which Shall Have Power to Act Only
as a World Police to Enforce Perma-
nent Peace on Earth

A definite contrast to all past and presently proposed plans of federations or unions or leagues of nations, whose mode of operation is talk.

PRICE OF THIS BOOKLET

Single Copy-----\$.50

4 Copies----- 1.00

30 Copies----- 5.00

Issued by

THE LANDONE FOUNDATION

ORLANDO, FLORIDA

COPYRIGHTED

All Rights Reserved, 1940

Printed in U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword of Three Plans.....	5
Interlogue One—The Union.....	9
Streit's Federal Union.....	11
<i>Will a Barrel of Emeralds on Your Front Lawn Keep Robbers Away?</i>	
Interlogue Two—The League.....	20
League of Nations.....	22
<i>Is It Wise to Choose Policemen, or Phonographs, for Police Duty?</i>	
Interlogue Three—How Soon?.....	28
There Is a Practical Means.....	30
<i>One Purpose—One Power—One Means</i>	
Genesis of Draft of The Super State.....	35
Explanatory Notes of The Super State.....	40
The Author	48

FOREWORD OF THREE PLANS

We want permanent world peace. This demands not only the establishment, but also the maintenance of peace.

Discussion, at many historic peace conferences, has often established peace between and among nations. But peace so established has never lasted.

To *maintain* peace differs from establishing peace. Enforcement, not discussion, is necessary for maintenance. For this, power and sometimes action are necessary.

We are now seeking some *kind* of Super State which shall be fitted to enforce and maintain permanent world peace.

To this end, the first step is a realization that there is NO need of discussion to determine either the world's desire for peace, or to maintain peace. There is no need to discuss whether it is best to have permanent peace, or to have world-wide mass murder every now and then. Hence, there is NO need for any League of Nations or any Federal Union to discuss the matter. And discussion, when there is no need of it, always leads to differences, dissension, disagreements, opposition and ultimately, conflict. This has been the cause of most of the failures of conferences and leagues organized in the past to maintain peace.

When the above truth is more fully realized, we shall be able more wisely to determine the *kind* of Super State needed to maintain permanent world peace.

There is much discussion today about the means of *establishing* peace when war shall end. But unfortunately, all we now hear—of hopes, intentions and plans—is almost word for word what we heard once before in 1918-1919.

And there is almost no word today of any practical means to be provided to *maintain* peace.

The last twenty years of dissension and now another war, have taught us who remember that we need something more and different from what was proposed in 1918 and effected in 1919-1920; and certainly it seems that we need something much more practical than any means which has as yet been proposed.

Hence the one problem with which we are here concerned is the *kind* of League, or Union, or Super State, which will have power sufficient to maintain world peace and prevent future wars.

The League of Nations has not been able to maintain peace, even when most nations were at peace and wanted peace to continue. The hypocrisy of its great nations is lamentable. Forty-one nations signed the League Covenant and sacredly promised to begin immediately to disarm. Then each great power at once began amazingly to increase its armed forces. When peace-loving small nations, led by Czechoslovakia in 1925, insisted on a plan for disarmament and peace, Chamberlain by his one veto vote in the League's Council, had power completely to kill that effort.

It was evident that the *people* of England and the British Empire wanted peace. But Chamberlain's action was so positive that all the smaller member nations—knowing that any one individual of the Council could at any time annul their plans for peace—realized that there was no use of repeating their efforts. Since the Covenant is the same today, giving absolute power by one veto vote to any member of the Council, it is evident that we need something very different from the League to act as a force for world peace.

Today a *Federal Union*—quite different from the League of Nations—is proposed by Clarence Streit. Its aim is to establish peace when war shall end. Whether or not it will even tend to preserve peace, we can judge only by the provisions of Streit's presentation. Streit's high idealism should be honored of all men, and his sincerity is without question. But his *plan* of a Federal Union is, however, so different from what we would expect of his idealism, that it is wise to consider its nature and provisions.

Before deciding to give up our national sovereignty to enter Streit's Federal Union, we want to know more of the *kind of democracy* on which it is to be based. It is something never before tried—doing away with the individual sovereign rights of nations, and making the *individual* the unit of a super-government. The nature of this proposed democratic individualism is important to us. Streit asserts that the Marxist theory of Communism in Russia IS compatible with democracy; and that its PRACTICE in Russia (and its practice must include the Stalin blood purges) has "*marked a substantial net advance for democracy*" over previous conditions there. This differs from our present ideal of democracy.

Then also, we desire to examine the significance of those "ten little words" in the *constitution* of the Streit Federal Union, found only once, and completely changing Streit's widely heralded ideal of initiating a Federal Union of fifteen democracies.

We need also to consider what our obligations as a member would be—to protect all the gigantic colonial empires of Belgium, France, Holland and Great Britain *against all invasion!*

What concerns us most, however, is whether Streit's Federal Union will even tend to maintain peace, or whether it will immediately lead to war far greater than any previously known on earth.

Streit's Tables of the *powers* of the democracies do not reassure us, for careful examination reveals that practically every factor which Streit lists as a power is a *possession*, and not a power at all.

We should remember that the great starving totalitarian powers are lacking the very possessions which democracies have in such abundance, and that these same dictatorship powers have openly avowed their intentions not only to get some of these resources, but to make war to get them.

The mere possession of a peck of emeralds strewn on your front lawn is *not* a power; rather than being a protection, it is a dangerous invitation to all thieves to come to steal them, and to use force (war, in case of nations) to get them! So we must carefully consider whether these possessions will lead to peace, or whether they will be a bid to the armed powers of Germany-Italy-Japan-Russia to attack us to get some of them.

We want permanent world peace; and it may be wise to abandon both the League of Nations and the plan of a Federal Union, and to form a Super State with power supreme to do but one thing—enforce permanent world peace.

Enforcement can not be effected by discussion. This should be very evident from the attempts of the last 126 years, from the time of the Holy Alliance up to our present year's experience with the League of Nations. We have made a mess of every effort to establish means of maintaining world peace, because in each case we have tried to unite the functions of a congress of discussion with a world police force.

We do not wish a talking Assembly of the League of Nations with all power centered in autocratic council, so

that the nations are unable to do anything, even when they desire to carry out plans to effect world peace.

And on the other hand, we may not want the Federal Union which Streit proposes trying to concern itself with a thousand different problems ranging from world wars and what kind of government we will approve in Egypt or Bolivia, down to regulating what a ton of hay shall weigh in the Philippines.

What we *want* is world peace—permanent world peace; and that demands enforcement. What we *need* is a World Police Force created by the nations, but not swallowing the nations.

Streit's Federal Union would have such power, but it would be attained by each nation *surrendering* its own sovereignty.

There is no need of this. We may not want a Union at all. We may want a *unity* of the nations, acting together to form a world police force of their own, which shall act for all nations to prevent war and maintain permanent peace.

To seek a basis of determining the *kind* of Super State we need to maintain world peace, we here present briefly the facts (a) of the Federal Union as it is proposed by Streit, (b) of the League of Nations, and (c) of a Super State which shall have *power* to enforce permanent peace.

INTERLOGUE ONE—THE UNION

To those who have not read the book *Union Now*, it should at once be stated that its author, Clarence K. Streit, has rendered a great service by many times emphasizing the weakness of an association or *league* of nations, and the strength of union, in which each nation surrenders its individual sovereignty. This is worthy of a book by itself.

Then also in this same book, Mr. Streit has clarified for us an inspiring ideal, for years inherent in our concept of democracy, yet never previously so clearly idealized. It is the ideal that, in true democratic government, unions should be formed of people, and not of political units. Streit even thinks that some such designation as the Union of the Free *People* of America would have been a much better name for our own country, than the choice our forefathers made of the United States of America. That is, Streit objects to our being a union of states, because a state is an independent sovereignty. Streit quotes Lord Lothian to the effect that the sovereign right of a nation to be itself, is the curse and cause of most of our troubles today.

Streit himself states that there is no possibility of solving the money and financial problems of the world, *until* nations give up their individual sovereignties and cease to be independent nations. To solve the financial problems of the world, he proposes a *common* budget. This is almost admission that there is no possibility of European democracies paying their debts, unless we surrender all our gold without compensation—as Streit suggests—and accept a common budget, so that our wealth can be used to pay their debts.

We are uplifted by Streit's presentation of high ideals of the freedom of the individual, of his concept of true democracy based on union of individuals, and by his remarkable laudation of Mohammedanism and what the Mohammedan religion has done for women. When he is writing his own consciousness into expression, we admire his presentation and—whether we agree with his ideas or not—we are impressed by the sincerity of the man.

We are, however, greatly confused by his process of reasoning. We DO believe that our country is potentially

more powerful in aviation than Germany; but we cannot understand the process of reasoning which concludes that the United States is potentially the stronger in aviation, **BECAUSE** we have fewer ox-drawn vehicles per capita than Germany has.

And we feel that we should wisely consider Streit's peculiar choice of figures in the Tables of Data contained in his book. For example, we are puzzled by his strange choice of data, which indicate that the United States Army has **MORE** trained fighting men than the German Army. We still do not understand why he does this, even though he ingeniously explains in a footnote how he chose these curious figures.

He explains that in countries like the United States, with forces on a *voluntary* service basis, he includes all enlisted men; but that in countries like Germany, where the men have long-term training, he *excludes most* of them. Hence, in his data of the German army, he does **NOT** include the millions of German reserve soldiers who have had two full years of exceptional military training; but in data of our army, he **DOES INCLUDE** all boys in the United States who have spent three months in any summer camp of any State National Guard!

Moreover, it is very difficult to believe that mere possession of immense wealth, which others are determined to take from us, is in itself a protection to us and a guarantee that we shall never be attacked by those who want our wealth. Viewed from this standpoint, it seems that Streit's proposed plan of a Federal Union of the World will not lead to peace, much less maintain peace.

Each of Streit's high ideals may appeal to each or all of us. But unless Streit's plan for a Federal Union of the World tends to establish and maintain peace, it is not of value to us now.

STREIT'S FEDERAL UNION

Will a Barrel of Emeralds on Your Front Lawn

Keep Robbers Away?

The plan of a Federal Union of the World, proposed by Streit in *Union Now*, is strongly approved in Great Britain and widely discussed in the United States.

In considering the plan, we wish to determine: (a) if it will lead to peace, or to greater wars; (b) what *kind* of democracy Streit advocates; (c) the *obligations* which would be imposed on the United States if it became a member; (d) *what* the probably resultant action of totalitarian powers would be; and (e) *why* Streit centers all power of the Union in its Senate, and then so constitutes the Senate that one great nation is given absolute control of it.

The pages of book, on which Streit's own provisions of the plan may be found, are indicated in what follows by numbers in parentheses.

We are impressed by Streit's high ideal, that true democracy must be based on unions of individuals. We are, however, a little puzzled by the kind of democracy Streit advocates. It is not clear to us. He bitterly criticizes German dictatorship, but sympathetically explains that Stalin's communistic dictatorship is probably (110) "immature democracy," and asserts, "I see no reason for hostility (114) between the nucleus (democracies) and Soviet Russia." He proclaims that Russia (161) prefers "to live peacefully" with the democracies; and when considering Russian communism, he adds, "Marxist political theory may (111) easily be compatible with democracy." Then Streit insists that the *practice* of this theory in Russia (practice includes Stalin's blood purges) HAS undoubtedly (111) marked "a *substantial net advance for democracy*" over conditions previously existing. And although he gives super-emphasis to the individual rights of all men of earth, yet he denies (185) the right to vote to all peoples of India, and excludes all the South American democracies because they might (109) "cause much needless argument."

This mixture of conflicting ideas is, to us, a *new ideal of democracy*.

Nevertheless, we are uplifted by Streit's assertion that there are *fifteen all-powerful democracies* in the world today—possessing “overwhelming world power (89) in every field”...“almighty (104) on this planet.” But after reading Streit's 178,000 words, in which he repeatedly states that these *fifteen* democracies are to be formed into a Federal Union, we are surprised by the “ten little words” (250) which provide that the Union may be established by *three nations only*—Great Britain, France and the United States—and that immediately these three nations shall have formed this Union, they—and they alone—are given *sole power* (246) to admit or bar any or all other nations; and that NO other nation may join this Union unless its ideas and mode of government are like (246) those of the three nations.

It seems evident that as soon as a Federal Union were formed of these three democracies, Great Britain would at once vote to admit Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and South Africa. And certainly the United States would not object to their admission, because their peoples are democratic and self-governing.

In line with Streit's ideal, that the individual (6) should be the *unit* in democracy, he proposes a House of Deputies, to be composed of representatives chosen (247) directly by peoples of all member nations. *Then we are amazed*—for Streit's plan next provides that NO act (248) of this democratic House of Deputies can become law UNTIL it is approved by the Senate of the Union; and his provisions for representation in the Senate give Great Britain, and her colonies and associates, absolute control of the Senate—*forever*, according to Streit's plan!

This is how it is done: Each nation of the Federal Union is allowed one senator for each $12\frac{1}{2}$ million of its people, up to a population of 100 million. By this plan (198), the United States would be allowed *eight** Senators. But, all the self-governing colonies or dominions of Great Britain are allowed two Senators each, even though not one of them has a population equal to that of Chicago and New York City. By this means, Great Britain—with its Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and South Africa—has two votes *more* than the combined votes of France and the United States.

Even if the seven other minor democracies of the fifteen which Streit designates, are immediately admitted to the Union, the result would—because of obligations soon to be considered—be still worse for the United States.

* On another page (248) Streit gives a different figure—10 Senators.

Streit's plan of creating a democratic House of Deputies; then depriving it of power and centering the power in the Senate, reminds us of the Preamble and Covenant of the League of Nations. Its Preamble gives power to member nations and to its Assembly; and then the Covenant annuls all such powers and centers all power in the Council.

There is another similarity: Each member of the Council of the League, by its right of one veto vote, is given absolute power to annul all acts of the Assembly or member nations. So also, by Streit's plan of the Federal Union, one nation—*Great Britain*, with her associates—is given absolute control of the Senate of the Federal Union.

This also reminds us of what one great nation was able to do, and did do, in the League of Nations, in stopping movements for the peace of the world, by use of her veto power in the Council. When smaller nations led by Czechoslovakia insisted on presenting a plan for disarmament, Chamberlain, on March 12, 1925, by the absolute power of his own veto vote, killed that effort toward peace, and opened the way for the greatest peacetime armament race in history. These facts make us wish carefully to consider the wisdom of any plan which would give such power to any one nation—whether it be Great Britain, France, or the United States.

Next consider *four obligations* which would greatly affect the United States if it joined the Federal Union.

First, each member nation at once (245) *transfers all its non-self-governing territories to the Union.*

Second, the Union is *immediately obligated to protect* (246) *ALL of these territories AGAINST ALL INVASION!* These territories include the gigantic colonial empires of Great Britain and France; and it is conceivable that Russia might sometime invade India; Japan invade Australia; and Italy invade France's colonies in Africa.

Three great factors are needed to protect these immense colonial areas against invasion. They are: gold-credit, resources and man-power. Britain and France are lacking in all of these. The United States can, and would be obligated to, provide all three!

Great Britain and France would, according to Streit's plan, have absolute power in the Senate of the Federal Union, and—IF the United States were a member—they would have the moral right to demand that we fulfill our pledged obligation. If we declined, then we would realize

that we had previously surrendered all our gold, and our navy and war aircraft, when we entered the Union.

If the seven other small democracies should immediately become members, then our obligations would be greatly increased. We would then be pledged to protect two other colonial empires—Holland's East Indian colonies and Belgium's African empire.

With our own modest little outlying islands, it is difficult for us to conceive the immensity of all these colonial empires, which we would be obligated to protect against all invasion. Their areas equal all of Canada, plus all of Mexico, plus all the nations of South America, plus all of Europe; and then *three* other areas added—*each* equal to all of the United States east of the Mississippi River! All in all, almost half the land area of earth—far flung, worldwide—on all continents and in all oceans—something to defend!

Third, the nations of Streit's Union are to accept a *common budget* (66, 68), *and to turn over all gold to the Union.*

Fourth, the Union—with a common budget and our gold—is to *assume payment of ALL debts of Great Britain and France* incurred by them in building up all their armies and navies, and air forces, *AND ALSO to assume payment of ALL the century-old debt which Great Britain and France have incurred in acquiring their vast colonial empires.* Streit' states, "It is only fair (257) that the Union should assume such debt."

Such obligations make us *think!*

We want world peace; but we are beginning to realize that there is a *plan, hidden* within the wish-ideal of Streit's proposal.

We can NOT believe that Streit—so sincerely idealistic—consciously realized the significance of this plan. It may be that his many-year contact with European diplomats in Geneva led him unconsciously to accept ideas which were very tactfully suggested by skilful diplomats. Whatever the source, the result is a *clever plan, clothed* with Streit's high idealism.

Streit's Tables of Data (95, 97, 99, 102) make us wonder. We too, would *like* to believe that democracies are all powerful, and that totalitarian powers are mere weaklings—but we cannot accept Streit's data (Table 5) that the total of trained effectives (102) of the army of the United States is 74.1% *greater* than all the well-trained soldiers of the German army; or that the number of war

aircraft of Great Britain and France is greater than the combined war air fleets of Italy and Germany and Japan. Moreover, Streit's admission (102-3) in his footnotes, that the data he uses in his Tables are different from what he knows to be true present data, does not restore our confidence.

We find that Streit's so-called *powers* of democracies are NOT powers at all, but lists of the *possessions* of the democracies—the very wealth which the totalitarian powers desire and are determined to take. As suggested in the title to this section, the mere possession of a barrel of emeralds is NOT a POWER which keeps robbers away.

Sometime we may decide that Streit's book is the strangest composite ever written. His ideals of individual freedom and his idealization of Mohammedanism are concisely and relatedly presented, and beautifully written. But Streit's reasoning—when he attempts to prove that the totalitarian powers will never dream of attacking the democracies—is not merely naive, it is fantastic!

Here is one sequence of thought:

First, Streit recognizes (96) that the great totalitarian nations ARE economically starved, and that their ONE (27) WAR PURPOSE is to get a share of the territory and raw material wealth of the democracies.

So second, he concludes that, since the democracies (7) are so rich—owning half the earth, 50% of nearly every essential, and most of the world's gold,—

THEREFORE, third, the totalitarian (7) powers—Germany, Italy and Japan—which ARE determined to get some of this wealth by a great (21) lightning war, will NEVER dream (7) of attacking the democracies which possess the wealth.

It IS a new kind of reasoning. Statements of cause and effect are often so separated that, rather than take time to discover the relationship, the ordinary reader merely accepts Streit's assertions.

Here is another sequence of thought, found within one page space: (a) the democracies "merely (160) by *establishing* the Union's could *reduce* their armaments, BECAUSE they own 50% of the earth, most of the essentials, and 90% of the gold; and THEN (b) the "heavily armed (161) states of central Europe"—Germany and Italy—would be so "*fearful*" of uniting with Japan and Russia; that (c) the democracies "would (161) have nothing to fear" from nations not in the Union; and (d) since Russia prefers (161) "*to live peacefully*" with the democ-

racies; THEREFORE (e) the German-Italian fear of "peaceful" Russia will be so great that it will (161) "throw" Germany and Italy to the side of the democracies.

In like manner, Streit concludes that "potentially" the United States (103) is stronger in aviation than Germany, BECAUSE we have fewer ox-drawn vehicles per capita than Germany; and he argues that—when his Federal Union wipes out all national industrial boundaries, and if American automobiles displace French cars in France—THEN the French automobile industry will not suffer greatly, BECAUSE a lot of old French automobiles will still be in use, and the great French automobile industry can go ahead making parts (267) for replacement in the old worn out automobiles!

In Streit's book, we find four kinds of presentation. First, his conclusions as to solution of practical problems are presented by fantastic sequences of thought; second, the plan of the Federal Union is clearly and cleverly conceived and skilfully intertwined with his own high ideals; third, the high idealism of Streit's own consciousness is expressed concretely and magnificently, with clarity of thought, fire of conviction and the light of illumination, as in the thirteenth chapter; and fourth—in trying to win Americans to accept his Federal Union—he seems, unconsciously, to have been led by wishful thinking to use a mode of presentation which business has tried for many years to discard as unethical. It is this: first present a truth that is so evident that your listener accepts it without question; then immediately follow it with a doubtful statement, so that the listener unthinkingly swallows the doubtful statement, merely because the first one is so self-evidently true.

In almost every chapter of his book, Streit repeats that our early confederation of colonies failed because of its weakness, and that our union of colonies succeeded because of the power given it. Then he repeatedly tells how ALL the colonies, in spite of their differences, united to form our national union. *All this is true; we accept it.*

Then Streit adds that *his Federal Union is to be formed in exactly the same way that our own thirteen colonies were formed into our national union.*

THIS SECOND STATEMENT IS NOT TRUE!

There is not even one element of truth in it, because ALL the colonies, no matter what their differences, united to form their union; while Streit proposes that only a FEW nations shall unite to form his Union, and that no others shall be admitted until they give up all

ideas of government in which they differ from the original few.

The colonies *practiced* the democracy in which they believed, that all men are created equal in the right to determine for themselves the kind of government they shall have. Hence, no matter how different the political and religious and economic ideas of the thirteen colonies, each gave up something of its ideas, so that ALL could unite to form a national union—Catholics of Maryland, Pilgrims of New England, commoners of Pennsylvania, and cavaliers of the South!

But Streit's plan is different! He proposes that a very FEW nations shall form a Union, and then say to the rest of the world—you may join us IF you adopt our ideas, and change yourselves enough so that we can approve of you. *Streit's method of presentation is not ethical!* Chapter by chapter, he tells truly what the colonies did, and the reader accepts it, because it is true. Then he repeatedly asserts that his method of forming a Federal Union is like the method the colonies followed. This is NOT true, yet thousands accept it, merely because the first statement is true.

IF Streit's plan HAD been tried by the colonies, then the rigid commoners of Massachusetts and Connecticut and Pennsylvania might have formed a union and said to the other colonies—"Our ideas are the only right ideas, and you can not join our union until you give up your ideas and accept ours; you of Maryland must give up your obedience to the Catholic Church, and you of the South must give up your great landed estates and your ideas of cavalierist superiority over people who work for you. Only after you have done this, will we consider whether or not we think you are fit to become one of us."

IF Streit's method HAD been used by the colonies, there would have been years of inter-colonial wars, and no union.

So also today, if Streit's plan is attempted, and the fifteen democracies—owning half the earth and most of its natural resources—should form themselves into a Union with definite intent not to let the totalitarian powers share in the wealth, until those autocracies become democracies, then the great armed and starved powers of Germany-Italy-Japan-Russia WILL start the greatest of all wars, to obtain some of the resources and territories of the democracies.

In Streit's proposed Federal Union, we find three basic essentials: first, his own high ideal of individual man as

the sovereign unit of true democratic government; second, what seems to be the creation of other minds—a very clever plan which strips the proposed democratic House of Deputies of all its power, and turns that power over to a Senate, which Senate is so constituted that one nation and its dependencies and associates are given absolute power; then third, there is a conflict of purposes.

The purpose of Streit's idealism is evident.

So also is the purpose of the *plan* hidden within it, and clothed by it.

Important as are the obligations of this amazing plan, we are not now concerned with the provisions that we should surrender our sovereignty as a nation; accept a common budget; obligate ourselves—because of our gold credit, available resources and man-power—to provide most of the means of defending the titanic territorial empires of Belgium, France, Holland and Great Britain; surrender our gold; and assume the part of the one creditor able to pay all the unpaid debts which the four great colonial nations have incurred in generations past, in acquiring one-half the world as their colonial empires.

Important as these obligations are to us, it is still more important now to decide whether or not Streit's Federal Union would, if established, tend to maintain peace or lead to the greatest war of all wars.

To make our decision justly, we must first recognize the power of the armed forces of the four great totalitarian nations, and their starved condition. Although Russia has resources, they are not yet easily available, and will not be for twenty years. Hence all four of the great dictatorships ARE starved nations. Streit recognizes this condition—stating that these powers—with all their masses of people—possess only from 1% to 10% of the essential resources of the world.

Then second, we must recognize that the great democratic nations which Streit proposes to form into a Union, possess one-half the territory of earth, 50% to 90% of the twenty-three most essential resources, and 90% of the world's gold.

Third, we must next recognize that these democracies—as armed powers—are not as strong as are the dictatorships, and never can be, unless they also become dictatorships.

Fourth, we should recognize that the *possessions* of the democracies are NOT powers.

Fifth, that the autocracies have openly avowed that they intend to secure—take by war and conquest—some of the territorial wealth and resources of the democracies, even if it is necessary to completely destroy such a power as Great Britain in order to obtain what they want.

Sixth, when we view facts clearly, without letting our wishful thinking run away with us, we realize how weak mere possessions are as means of protection; and that—in the present economic set-up of the world—they may be weakening dangers instead of powers of defense.

So, seventh, it seems evident that Streit's Federal Union, if formed, would result in greater wars than man has yet known. You can not loudly tell a strong and powerful and poverty-stricken man that you have millions of ten-dollar bills lying around loose on your front porch, without his trying to get them—particularly if he has already declared that he will, if necessary, use force to get some of them.

INTERLOGUE TWO—THE LEAGUE

Nineteen years and seven months after the first meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, the armies of Germany marched into Poland. Four days later, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Great Britain announced that it was evident to all the world, that the League was *dead*. Ninety-three days later, after Russia had attacked Finland, the *same* Minister announced that the League was *alive*—a powerful international force, to be used to unify the aid of neutral nations to Finland.

The *concept* of a League, with power to establish and maintain peace, suffered abortion, and was never born.

But the League of Nations as born, has never died—even though some of its functions have been afflicted with shaking palsy, ever since birth.

Nevertheless, the League—in coordinating and promoting world welfare work—has been, is, and can continue to be, the greatest international organization ever created by the cooperation of nations.

Moreover, the League is not an impractical dream. It was born of a dream-ideal; and it could have been made practical, IF the provisions of its Covenant had continued the promise of its Preamble.

Since we now seek a sure means of maintaining world peace, we are not here concerned with the actual or reputed failures of the League, except to learn *what* caused the failures, so we shall not repeat them in any re-formation of the League or in the structure of any Super State we may organize to maintain world peace.

The one question most pertinent to us now, is: Can the League be used as it is, or reconstituted or re-formed in any way, so that it will have influence to establish world peace, and power to maintain it?

The League has been commended, even lately. Earl de la Waar, September 16, 1938, declared, "If there is one thing on which I would expect complete unanimity in the Assembly, it is that there is nothing essentially wrong with the Covenant." So far as the present writer knows, this is either the most ignorantly silly or intentionally

deceptive statement ever made about the League. Every *thinking* advocate or opponent of the League realizes that everything that is wrong with the League is due to its Covenant.

Its Preamble creates a *democratic* League, with power residing in its member nations, to cooperate to *achieve international peace*.

But the Covenant strips all member nations of all power in the League, and creates an *absolute autocracy* in its Council, endowed with power to enforce sanctions and call on all nations *to make war*.

This difference is the cause of all the opposing opinions about the League. Advocates of the League view it as proclaimed in its *Preamble*, and have faith in it; opponents of the League review the acts of the Council as empowered by the *Covenant*, and conclude that even in times of peace, its autocracy tends to war.

Our purpose is to disregard conflicting opinions, and determine if it is wise to attempt to re-constructure the League, to make it powerful enough to establish and maintain world peace:

Whether re-organized or not, we must *continue* the League of Nations as the one amazingly efficient means of carrying on the very valuable work it has done in the collection and distribution of world data, in the advancement of cooperation in meeting humanitarian needs; and in the promotion of the welfare of world labor, health, education and morals.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Is It Wise to Choose Policemen, or Phonographs, for Police Duty?

Its advocates must convert its opponents, if the League of Nations is to be changed to such an extent that it can act as a power to establish and enforce world peace.

To effect such a conversion, the advocates must, themselves, recognize the evils of the intertwined and annulling provisions of the Covenant, and be willing to eliminate them. It is attempted here, to *relate** these widely separated and conflicting provisions of the Covenant, so that each provision is clear in its entirety, and by itself.

To do this briefly is difficult, because of *intertwined* obligations, *separated* modifications, *subsequent cancellations*, and *deceptive* statements of absolute powers as mild requirement. For example, in one case, an obligation is *intertwined* with other subjects in four different Sections and three different Articles; the simple right of Assembly vote is restricted in fourteen *widely separated* paragraphs; ALL important powers given to the nations and to the Assembly and to the Court of International Justice are cancelled in subsequent sections; and an absolute autocratic power, stated as a mild requirement, IS deceptive—for example, the simple provision for unanimous vote in the Council seems to be a simple provision for unanimity and harmony of the Council members, but in truth it is an absolute *autocratic* power, by means of which any *one* member of the Council can, by his one veto vote, ANNUL any decision of the forty to sixty member nations of the League, and any or all decisions of the Assembly or International Court for which approval of the Council is necessary, and the Council's approval is required on every important matter.

As the provisions become clear in what follows, the reader will understand that the League has failed only in what the Council has done or not done; and he will realize and more fully appreciate the inestimably valuable work

* A correlated chart of these was prepared by Brown Landone in 1920.

which has been done by the Secretariat. It is believed that when these facts are known, both advocate and opponent will resolve that the real work of the League *must* be continued, even if it be necessary to discard the present Covenant and kill the Council forever.

The Covenant giveth all things and the Covenant taketh all things away—that is, it ANNULS ALL powers of the member nations, ALL powers of the Assembly, and ALL powers of the Court of International Justice.

By the Preamble, all member nations join the League, as high contracting parties, having power to “promote international co-operation.”

But the *Covenant* strips all member nations of all powers in the League, and leaves them only five minor rights and privileges, three of which are subsequently restricted.

For example, a nation's right to cast one vote in the Assembly (3-4) is practically annulled by a later Section which provides that *all* votes of all the nations may be made void by one veto vote of one member of the Council (15-16). And each nation's right to withdraw from membership is restricted by thirteen different limitations in six different Articles and eight different Sections of the Covenant, which give control of such withdrawal to the Council, although the Council has never yet dared to use its particular power in this matter. Then also, each nation's right to “take” any circumstances whatever to the League for settlement (11-12) is limited by the obligation that the nation *must* take it to the Council in which the nation may not be represented, and NOT to the Assembly in which the nation is certain to have a representative; and the nation's right to take any of its disputes with other nations to the Court of International Justice, is *completely annulled* by the provision that each nation is obligated to take all such disputes to the Council and its boards, NOT to the Court.

When the Covenant completes its *stripping of member nations*, they are powerless to co-operate in the League. The only unrestricted privilege left to a nation is to pay its quota of League's expenses. *The only unrestricted right left to any nation is the right to send a woman instead of a man as representative to the Assembly.*

One need no longer wonder why the nations of the League have not been able to co-operate to achieve international peace and security.

The Assembly was born to be naught but the weeping ghost of all those increasing rights attained by man and

given to Assemblies and Congresses as powers by 600 years of democratic advance. The Covenant of the League *strips its Assembly of all power*; and leaves it with but one unrestricted right.

The Assembly is permitted to offer *advice* (19) to member nations to reconsider their respective treaties; but its right to "deal" with any matter affecting the peace of the world (3-3, 11-2) is made null and void by the subsequent provision that it can take NO action on such matters, and can NOT even bring such a matter to its own attention, 'because each nation is *obligated* to submit every such matter to arbitration boards or the Council, and NOT to the Assembly (12-1, 14-1). Thus the Assembly's power to "deal" with any important matter *completely vanishes*.

When the Covenant finishes stripping the Assembly of its power, *the Assembly has but one unrestricted right left—it can meet when it pleases* (3-2).

The Court of International Justice is the Supreme Court of the world, and any sincere plan would have given it power to settle disputes by decisions which could not be annulled. The League's Covenant does, at first, give such power to the Court of International Justice, by the provision (14) that the Court shall be "competent to hear and determine ANY international dispute." Then comes the first restriction in the added words, "*which the parties thereto* submit to it."

This is the nadir of the despicable hypocrisy of the Covenant: (a) the Court shall have power to determine any dispute which the *parties thereto* (nations) submit to it; then (b) NO dispute of member nations can be submitted to the Court *by the parties thereto*, because (c) each member nation is obligated to submit ALL its important disputes NOT to the Court, but to the Council or arbitration boards. Thus the Court is stripped of all power to act as a court.

The Court, however, is given power to act also as a Board of *Arbitration*. As arbitrator, the Court power is limited to such cases as are *not* submitted to special arbitration boards or to the Council. And since each nation is obligated to submit ALL such cases to arbitration boards or the Council, NO nation is allowed to take such a case to the Court for arbitration. Thus the Court is stripped of its power to act as *arbitrator*.

Although ALL powers are stripped from the Court of International Justice by the Covenant, it is left with one *privilege*, similar to that possessed by any student of law. Although NO member nation is permitted to take any

dispute directly to the Court, its dispute may be referred to the Court by the Council. In such a case, the Court is *permitted* to give an *advisory opinion*—not to the nations concerned in the dispute, but to the Council. And this advice has no more binding power than the *advice* a subservient attorney might give to an arrogant client.

Ultimately ALL powers are stripped from the member nations, the Assembly and the Court of International Justice.

In contrast, THE COUNCIL is so overpowered, that it has been scared into impotency. It is given all power of the League—so much power that it has never dared to use it against any nation of importance.

As a supreme ultimate, the Council is given power to enforce economic sanctions and blockades against any individual nation, IF any PERSON or group of peoples in any nation do anything which the Council “believes” might *tend* to endanger the peace of the world!

Giving this particular power to the Council, is *the revival of a mode of punishment so unjust that it was abandoned by all enlightened nations 400 years ago*. It was the law and practice of punishing an entire community, for the acts or intentions of an individual in the community. Such laws were once common. For example, ALL the people of a shire in England could be and were often punished, if but *one* individual in the shire committed a crime. This is the basic principle of the supreme power which the Covenant gives to the Council—to shut off food and other supplies from an entire nation of people, if a dictator and a few followers do anything which the Council “thinks” may *tend* to disturb the peace of the world.

Given all power, the Council found itself powerless in all important matters, because of its fear of using its power against nations of importance.

So the Council employed its power only in dealing with small nations, and only when advantageous to nations of its own members. It began this, at its beginning: When 3,000,000 Armenians were being slaughtered and annihilated, the Council “decided” it could not take time to consider the problem, and continued its work of that day—allotting the profits of inter-nation railway travel in Europe. The record from 1919, to 1929, to 1939—has not varied.

Through nineteen years the Council was *dead* to the pleas of small or weak nations, being destroyed. But late in 1939 it was “*made alive*” again. It was then advan-

tageous to nations represented on the Council, to rally neutral nations to aid Finland, although no similar effort had been made to help China or Abyssinia, Czechoslovakia or Poland.

The Covenant of the League of Nations strips the Assembly and the International Court of power, and centers all power of the League in its Council. That Council by its *attitude* toward small nations, and by its *acts*—as of 1925, in annulling efforts tending to disarmament and peace—disqualifies itself as an agent of world peace.

We have to this point seen the League as it is — the result of what the Covenant has made it. We have not, however, yet considered *the one great cause of inherent weakness in the League*. This weakness is all important in determining whether or not the League can be re-organized so that it can become a power in maintaining the peace of the world.

Only the *nations* of the League want peace.

The Council itself has not been sincerely concerned with peace, and because of the interests of the nations represented in the Council, its members will forever be more concerned with scheming for balances of power more favorable to them, than in surrendering powers to promote world peace.

Therefore, all plans for re-organizing the League of Nations, to make it a power for peace, must depend on restoring power to the *nations* of the League, and their unrestricted representation in the League Assembly.

But even if the Assembly of the League be re-constituted to give it full power as a World Congress, it would still be merely the *talking* branch of an international government. And NO talking branch of any government is of any value in enforcing peace.

To act wisely in determining means which can maintain peace, we must consider two self evident truths, the significance of which we have not yet fully recognized. First, as previously stated, there is NOTHING to discuss as to choice of peace or war. And hence, there is NO need to establish any World Assembly or Federal Union Congress to discuss such a question. And, second, permanent peace must be *enforced*. Perhaps the best five-word criticism of the League of Nations, is Stuart Chase's statement in his *Our New Western Front*, that, in the League, "*there was no world policeman*."

To maintain peace, we need a super police force, not a talking Assembly or Congress. Unified power of action IS

necessary to enforce and maintain peace; and NO Assembly or Congress—which by its very nature acts as an aggregation of loud-speakers—can ever unify itself as power of action.

Too much TALK is the greatest weakness of democratic government. Our desire and intent to establish peace may be clarified by discussion. But the maintenance of permanent peace is different from temporarily establishing peace. *Maintenance* of peace depends on *enforcement* of peace. In enforcement, discussion is a disruptive factor ultimately preventing the maintenance of peace.

So, in seeking some super organization able to establish and main world peace, we must either completely re-form the League of Nations, or constitute some new form of Super State with power to enforce permanent peace.

We have examined the Federal Union, and found it wanting;—for as at present proposed by Streit, it will lead to war, not to peace. We have examined the League of Nations and its Council in which all its power resides, and found the Council wanting, in both intention and effort to maintain peace.

So let us now turn to the consideration of a Super State, which shall be given power to enforce world peace, and be consecrated to that one high purpose.

The author, however—before proceeding to the next section—wishes to reiterate that the *League of Nations must be continued*, even though every section of its Covenant be killed except its provision creating its Secretariat. An Assembly of the League of Nations is essential, but it should be freed of all the restrictions of the present Covenant, so that it can freely and openly discuss international problems. And the League should be continued, so that its Secretariat can continue to carry on the work it has done so exceptionally well—collecting and publishing world data, and acting as an international clearing house and aid in matters of labor, education, health and moral conditions of the world!

INTERLOGUE THREE—HOW SOON?

Will it be thirteen months or seven years before all nations at war will *gladly* surrender all armaments and means of making war, to a Super State which shall have power to enforce world peace?

Or will they never do it? Great surprises await us, and soon!

Because modern war is very strange!

When a great nation fights another great nation today, it destroys itself. The damage it does to itself is much greater than the harm it does the enemy.

Modern war is not primarily battles and air raids. Modern war is *economic revolution*—swift and terrible in destruction. Modern war is a gigantic monster which gulps down wealth and eats up the living of all people.

That always leads to *socialistic revolution*! That is why all great nations at war will soon be willing, *even anxious*, to accept the Super State. The time will soon come.

Totalitarianism had already conquered England within sixty days after Germany marched into Poland. And France also, and every nation at war! Each accepted and adopted totalitarianism, and put it into use. Its autocracy was made supreme—no one could produce, sell, buy or eat what he pleased; even his individual right to get up or go to bed whenever he desired, disappeared. Also within sixty days great wealth began vanishing; thousands of private businesses in England and France were wiped out; factories were conscripted to turn out products which destroy themselves. England, for example, began consuming \$1,000,000 private capital every 60 minutes! Soon it will be \$5,000,000. In all nations at war, and all others preparing to defend themselves, not merely money but capital wealth itself is disappearing at a titanic rate. Nothing is restoring the capital destroyed.

Socialistic revolution immediately appeared in nations at war. Families of millions of soldiers are being supported by governments, paid for by taxation. To take a man from private life and fit him to fight and be killed, costs \$25,050. Then it costs \$107 more to kill him off.

After his death, his family must be taken care of for years.

Modern war consumes not only wealth, but the life of the people. By December of 1939, people of nations at war had no white bread, almost no butter, little meat, often no coffee; frequently no coal even in zero weather; living without warm baths; in the darkness of blackouts; ever ready to hide as gas-masked and snouted humans; a return to caveman dwellings underground. *Such were the results of only sixty days of modern war. Vision what conditions will be, after five years of war! Even two years!*

Communism will follow if this socialistic revolution is continued. Every world leader knows this. Great battles may be delayed; but the Molech of consumption destroys RAPIDLY. The time will come soon! When all nations at war will be bled white, then every leader and government at war must save themselves or be destroyed. Unless they can offer some new hope to the people, there will be revolution. Nothing will save them, *unless the people are given a hope in which they can have faith!*

At such a time, every war leader will willingly accept peace, IF he can win the praise of his own people for doing it.

Meanwhile, nothing will be done to make the birth of the Super State premature.

But when nations near self-destruction, and when each leader can tell his own people that NEVER again will any nation ever have power to make war on them; when he can tell them that in the future they will be free to determine their own national life; free to purchase resources from any territory on earth; free to expand their national development limited only by their own capacity—when each leader can tell his own people that they can HAVE all these things, IF they and all other nations surrender all their armed forces to a Super State, so that no nation on earth should ever again have the means of attacking any other nation—*THEN the Super State WILL BE BORN!* If war continues, it will come quickly!

THERE IS A PRACTICAL MEANS

One Purpose—One Power—One Result

We need a Super State consecrated to ONE purpose, given but ONE power, to attain but *one* result. Then man shall be able to enforce a permanent peace on earth which will solve most inter-nation problems.

But any league or union, trying to meddle in and solve all minor problems, will do naught but create more friction.

The League of Nations, for example, has had power for twenty years to consider "any circumstance whatever." That is one reason why it has made a mess of its attempt to use its powers—war in Ethiopia and Japan and China; milk for babies in Poland; the puzzle of which nations should be blamed when the *Chinese* attack *Japanese* troops with airplanes supplied by *France*, and the *Japanese*—using bombs made in *Germany* and airplanes from *Italy*—bomb the *Chinese* hidden in the building of a *United States* missionary! Then also, disagreements over profits of international railway tickets have led to months of discussion. So many powers and so many problems, means much talk and little done.

Similarly, the Senate of the Federal Union, as proposed by Streit, would be given a multitude of powers to handle a host of problems—imposing taxes on us to pay the colonial debts of Great Britain and France; preventing South Africa from abrogating contracts between a white and black; determining the value of a Japanese yen in Bombay; using our gold to pay for England's mandate over Palestine; sending our young men to Borneo or Indo-China to prevent invasion by Japan, or to Sudan to prevent invasion by Italy—so many powers, so many problems. It is amazing. Streit *seriously* proposes that his Federal Union shall have power to take over absolute sovereignty of each nation and to determine the weight of a pound of butter in Arizona! Try to do everything, and nothing will be done.

Super State shall have NO such power! Each nation will retain its sovereignty. In this plan, the nations will do but one thing new—create a Super State as their Police Force of the World. With but one purpose and one power

—and with NO discussion to create friction—the one aim CAN be attained!

Super State will be a UNITY of nations.

The League of Nations is nothing but a *list* of non-unified nations. And Streit's Federal Union *demand*s that there shall be no more real nations—that each nation shall surrender its national sovereignty to form his proposed union. In fact, the proposed Federal Union would create *dis-unity*—for it would be a bloc of democratic nations, opposed to a group of totalitarian nations—a house divided within itself—ripe for continuous dissension.

The Super State will be honest in living up to its ideal of the individual freedom and right of all men and nations to choose their own form of government. In contrast, the Preamble of the League promises democracy, and then its Covenant changes it to absolute autocracy. And although the Federal Union *professes* to proclaim freedom of all men and their inherent right to govern themselves, still it insists that 428,000,000 peoples of four great nations shall not have the inherent right to be considered equals, unless they give up their right as free men to determine their own respective forms of government, and change their ideas to agree with those of the Federal Union.

The Super State will NOT be formed of nations of one ideology only, *because peoples and their ideologies can not be killed off*. Democracy means the freedom of individuals to determine their own mode of government. Leaders may be deposed or assassinated; but peoples and ideologies live on. So the Super State will be formed of all nations—not a union, but a unity of all. Only thus can future wars be avoided.

Super State will exist by itself. In contrast the League of Nations has been enmeshed in the *midst* of powerful and quarreling nations, and tied to them. Streit's Federal Union would be located *everywhere!* Streit proposes that its House of Deputies shall hold its sessions—as one-night stands—in New Zealand or Algiers, British Columbia or South Africa.

Super State will own *oceanic islands* as territories of its own, so that it shall be apart from all nations, and all nations free of it! Super State shall at all times *keep* its armed forces—armies, navies, aircraft—at its own oceanic island bases, except when necessary to use such forces temporarily to maintain peace.

Super State shall possess NO power, encroaching on the rights of nations; it shall have NO power whatever, except to preserve the peace of the world—power to pre-

vent any nation taking aggressive action against any other nation, to maintain the freedom of all seas, and to lessen age-long causes of war.

This last shall include NO power to take or even allot any raw materials of the world. Super State shall, however, have power to prevent any one nation from withholding sales of raw materials to any one nation, IF it is selling such materials. *That is, to preserve world peace, the Super State shall have police power, NOT to control materials, but to prevent international hi-jacking of raw materials and blackmail by world trade!*

Super State will have NO assembly or congress of any kind—to talk and create differences and dissension.

The Assembly of the League *has spent twenty years in talk!* It has created more differences and dissension than any other world organization in history. No matter what its sincerity, it has never been able to agree upon any one thing—not even on its action regarding Russia's invasion of Finland.

And Streit's proposed Federal Union—with its common budget and use of resources of the United States to meet age-old debts of Great Britain, its plans for our defense of titanic colonial territories of other nations—all these matters would lead to endless talk, and greater dissension than even the League has created.

Super State's *one purpose* shall be to preserve peace. On the question of whether we want peace, or whether nations shall be allowed to murder each other, there is *nothing* to discuss. Hence, as stated, Super State shall have NO talking assembly or congress. To enforce peace, discussion is no more needed than a city police force needs a congress to discuss which gang of boys shall be allowed the largest rocks to hurl at one another.

Super State will be *independent*.

The League of Nations is subservient to its autocratic Council. The Federal Union—as proposed by Streit—would be under absolute control of ONE nation and its associates, because of that nation's control of the Senate of the Union.

The Super State can NEVER be controlled by any great populous nation or group of such nations, because there is NO representation according to population. (Proportional representation is essential only when there are problems to be settled by discussion.) Needing NO discussion to maintain peace, the Super State shall be composed of an EQUAL number of representatives from

EVERY nation. This is just, for peace is as important to a Finland or a Latvia as to Great Britain or France.

The Super State will NOT be financially dependent on any nation or group of nations. The League, for its expenses, is dependent on the whims of its prosperous member nations. The Federal Union would take over all gold and all money of its nations, and this gold and money would be controlled by the one nation controlling its Senate. In contrast, the Super State *financially* will be made *permanently independent* by means which are also financially beneficial to all nations. (See Section Sixth of Draft.)

The Super State can NEVER become a super-militaristic power, because its Supreme Peace Council shall NOT itself have control of producing the means and processes used by its armed forces. That is, although the Supreme Peace Council shall have right to USE the army and navy and aircraft of the Super State to maintain peace—it shall have NO power to increase armament production or perfect any new discovery of destructive gases or rays. These functions shall be under the control of a *Peace Armanent Board*, which shall be composed of experienced executives of prominent religious movements of the world.

It has been objected that such men are idealists. This is true; and idealism is needed for control of the means of war. Executive idealists are practical—everything worth while ever done on earth, has been done by idealists. No group of men, except religious leaders who have also been *experienced executives* for twenty years, will possess both the idealism and capacity needed in the work of this board.

Since all nations shall surrender their armies and armament, the armed force of the Super State will gradually be reduced to a minimum. *With all nations disarmed, only an insignificant force will be needed!*

Simplicity, directness, limitless results.

Once all nations are disarmed, neither national industry nor world trade will be limited as in the past by armed control of ports or seas or fear of forever preparing for war. With peace enforced, nations will produce wealth which will *not* be used up in costs of armaments and war. Then, man can forge ahead, fulfilling his demands for the ultra-comforts and luxuries he desires, because—with the wealth previously spent for armanet and wars—man will be able to pay for the things he wants. This is a gigantic factor. If the Super State had been in operation as of August 1939, the \$216,000,000,000 of destruction and spend-

ing of a subsequent twelve months of war could have been spent for man's needs—18 billion dollars *a month!*

Simplicity, directness, limitless results!

With a Super State there could be NO problem of Russia and Finland—for, with all nations disarmed, including Russia—Russia, with *no* navy, would not even desire *naval* bases to protect its Leningrad seaport or control the Baltic Sea; Finland could not have been invaded by armed forces; and there would be no problem of the Dardenelles; no problem of Italy and Great Britain over the Suez, et cetera. And when resources of the world can no longer be held in bondage by armed forces of great powers, all the major causes of friction over resources and living space will disappear.

With a Super State consecrated to one purpose, having but one power, to be used to attain but one result—and with NO World Congress to talk and create disagreement—permanent peace can be attained, and the prophesied good will to men on earth can become a reality.

The *Draft* which follows in the next section embodies in a crude and tentative form the principles of the Super State herein briefed. Immediately following are notes on its *origin*, the expectancy and *disappointment* of 1918-1919, the resulting *opposition*, and the need *today*.

GENESIS OF DRAFT OF SUPER STATE

Origin: This draft has its genesis in work done in Europe from 1911 to 1914 by officials and private citizens working to create an United States of Europe. The work was interrupted by the War, and later put aside by advent of the League of Nations.

Expectancy and Disappointment: During the Peace Conference of 1918-1919, the hope that a world organization would be effected and given power to enforce permanent peace, took on the fervor of spiritual expectancy. Then the Constitution of the League of Nations was made public.

To those who had worked for a Super State of effective power, this constitution was a disappointment: (1) the Assembly of the League was given *no* power to do anything except talk; (2) the Supreme Council could do nothing unless its members unanimously agreed that they agreed on the subjects of which they talked; (3) the one power of action provided for, was that of enforcing economic isolation of an aggressor nation; but (4) the principle on which this is based is a reversion to a mode of punishment so unjust that it was abandoned by civilized nations 400 and more years ago.

Opposition: Because of these features, the author—who had waited for months in 1919 with almost prayerful expectancy for announcement of a real league which could ensure peace—campaigned in 1919-1920 against the proposed United States membership in the League of Nations.

Today: Again it is evident that nothing but power to enforce peace can establish permanent world peace. Its author is cognizant of its crudeness of form and inept phraseology; but holds (1) that a Super State must not be a talking international congress; (2) that it must be limited to the one function of enforcing peace; (3) that it must be financially independent of all nations; (4) that provision against dominance of the Super State is essential; and (5) that it must own all major instruments of war, to the end that no nation or group of nations shall ever again be able to make war.

Then we shall have peace!

A SUPER STATE
which
Shall Have Power
to
ENFORCE PERMANENT WORLD PEACE
Tentative Draft

Cognizant of the failure of attempts to maintain world peace by talking federations or leagues or unions of nations, we consecrate ourselves to the ideal of a Super State which shall have power to enforce permanent world peace. The essentials of the Super State shall be:

FIRST, all nations shall **SURRENDER**¹ to the **SUPER STATE** all their war equipment and armaments of all kinds,²—to the end that **NO** nation or group of nations shall ever again possess the means of making war.³

SECOND, with formation of the Super State, every nation shall **LOSE** its right to **CHOOSE** whether it shall or shall not surrender its armed forces.*

* As a policeman has the right to compel any unlawfully armed maurauder to surrender his gun and as the maurauder has no right of choice in the matter, so also the Super State shall have power to compel any unwilling nation to surrender its means of making war, and the nation shall have no choice in the matter.

¹See Explanatory Note ONE—The Time When Great Powers Will be Anxious to Surrender Their Armed Forces.

²See Explanatory Note TWO—What Each Nation Shall Surrender to the Super State.

³See Explanatory Note THREE—Benefits to Each Nation by its Surrender of its Armaments.

THIRD, the Super State shall have power to **PREVENT** any nation or people from taking any aggressive war action against any other nation or people, and power to **ENFORCE** peace if any nation or leader or group of nations or leaders shall have started aggressive war action.

FOURTH, the **TERRITORIES** of the Super State shall be Oceanic Islands, separate⁴ and apart from the mainlands of all nations.

FIFTH, the Super State shall **NOT** be initiated⁵ until great powers shall be willing to join in its formation; and it shall **NOT** be organized⁶ by any group of nations of but one ideology of government.

SIXTH, the **FINANCIAL STABILITY** of the Super State shall **NEVER** be impaired by any nation decreasing its financial support for any reason whatsoever; therefore, each nation shall surrender to the Super State permanent ownership of one-tenth of the bonds of its national debt, with provision that (1) the *principal* of said bonds shall never be paid, and that (2) the *interest* of said bonds shall be paid ⁷ semi-annually to the Super State for so long as the nation shall exist.

SEVENTH, to **PRESERVE** the **IMPARTIALITY** of the Super State, **NO** nation shall have any representation⁸ in the Super State, either because of or in proportion to, its area or population or wealth,—to the end that no one nation or group of nations shall ever unduly influence or obtain control of the Super State.

⁴See Explanatory Note **FOUR**—Proposed Oceanic Island Bases and Territories of the Super State.

⁵See Explanatory Note **FIVE**—Nature of Preliminary Procedure in the Formation of the Super State.

⁶See Explanatory Note **SIX**—Actual Organization of the Super State.

⁷See Explanatory Note **SEVEN**—Action in Case of Default of Interest Payment.

⁸See Explanatory Note **EIGHT**—Preservation of Impartiality of the Super State.

EIGHTH, to PREVENT any possible future development of Machiavellian power in the Super State, the Executive power⁹ of said Super State shall be vested in a Supreme Peace Power Council which shall be composed of not less nor more than TWO life members from EACH nation; and the Super State shall have NO right or power to station any part of its army at any time on the territory of any nation, except when preventing attempted aggression against that nation; and all ships of the navy and aircraft of the airforce of the Super State, shall be kept at its Oceanic Island Bases, except when being used to enforce world peace; and the Supreme Peace Power Council shall have NO control of Peace Armament Board.

NINTH, to PRESERVE the POWERS of individual NATIONS, the Super State shall possess NO power other than its right to preserve the peace of the world, maintain freedom of the seas, and lessen the age-long causes of war; it shall possess NO power to regulate or control the activities of the citizens of any nation; it shall possess NO power to interfere with the policy or ideology or form of government¹⁰ of any nation; and it shall possess NO power to interpret the laws of any nation.

TENTH, the Super State shall maintain its army and navy and aircorps bases only ON or AT its Oceanic Island Bases and Territories; said ARMED POWER¹¹ of the Super State to consist of (1) a Super State Army composed of 5% of the regulars of the present armies of the nations of the world; and (2) a Super State Navy of all naval ships of all kinds surrendered to the Super State,

⁹See Explanatory Note NINE—Prevention of Super State Becoming a Machiavellian Power.

¹⁰See Explanatory Note TEN—National Maintenance of Order and Licenses and Sales to Nations.

¹¹See Explanatory Note ELEVEN—Organization of Armed Power of Super State.

and sufficient naval personnel; (3) a Super State *Air Force* of all war aircraft surrendered to the Super State, and sufficient personnel; and (4) a *Super State Armament and Equipment Works* of which a Peace Armament Board shall have absolute control.

ELEVENTH, the Super State's ARMAMENT AND EQUIPMENT WORKS shall be established on one or more Oceanic Island Bases separate from all other activities under control of the Executive Supreme Peace Power Council; and said Armament and Equipment Works shall be under absolute and secret control of the Peace Armament Board, which Board shall own and control all secret formulae, processes, inventories and scientific discoveries—of rays or substances—of a destructive nature.

Said Board shall be composed of leaders of religions of peace; each member of said Board shall be elected for life by a religious organization in which he shall have served as an executive twenty years in consecrated work for the welfare of man; there shall be one member of said Board for each nation; said Board shall have autocratic power in employment of scientists to work in its research and production laboratories; and the Supreme Peace Power Council shall have NO power whatsoever, to regulate or limit, or in any way control the activities and work of the Peace Armament Board.

TWELFTH, the Super State shall possess SPECIAL POWERS of GOVERNING by decree, its Oceanic Island Bases and Territories and all its armed forces and all inhabitants living within the boundaries of its bases and territories; and the Super State shall have power to issue decrees of international law, *limited* (1) to main-

¹²See Explanatory Note TWELVE—Economic Rights of Nations.

taining equal freedom of all seas for all nations and their nationals, and (2) to preventing the economic starvation of any individual nation.¹²

THIRTEENTH, the Super State shall establish a WORLD CITIZENSHIP based on the ideal of the brotherhood of man—to the end that each such world citizen shall have the right to citizenship¹³ in each nation in the world, in the same way that each citizen of the United States now has right to citizenship in any State of the United States.

* * * * *

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Explanatory Note ONE—Time When the Great Powers Will Be Anxious to Surrender Their Armed Forces:

World war of today or tomorrow will be carried on until all the powers engaged in war have nearly destroyed each other. *When that time comes, ALL such powers will be defeated nations!* Each will be financially ruined, its armies and navies and air forces worn down, economic system shattered, people taxed unto poverty, millions of young men dead, populations in need of food, and ready for revolution unless the deprivation and slaughter cease.

At such a time, every government at war, will seek desperately to find a way out, without admitting its surrender to any other power or group of powers. And national leaders will willingly accept any sane proposal for peace which will relieve them of the necessity of admitting to their respective peoples, that they are defeated leaders.

AT SUCH TIME, the United States shall exert its influence and power, with other co-operating neutral nations, to the end that all powers at war shall unite in organizing a Super State which shall have power to enforce peace.

When nations have nearly destroyed each other, the demand for a Super State can be made effective.

¹³See Explanatory Note THIRTEEN—Voidance of Causes of War by World Citizenship.

Explanatory Note TWO — What Each Nation Shall Surrender:

Each nation shall surrender to the Super State, all its means of making war: (1) all equipment and armament of its armies, (2) all ships of all kinds of its navy, (3) all its war aircraft, (4) *temporary* control of the personnel of all its armed forces, (5) all munition plants and other means of producing equipment or munitions of war, (6) all inventions and designs of means of warfare and all chemical formulae of explosives and war gases, and (7) all other formulae or processes or materials used primarily in preparing for war or carrying on war.

Provision shall be made for licensing (1) the use of small arms needed by police forces of each nation, and (2) use of chemical processes and inventions necessary in industry or for scientific purposes.

Explanatory Note THREE—Benefits to Each Nation by its Surrender of its Armaments:

Great financial benefits will accrue to every nation by its surrender of its war equipment and means of providing armament: (1) taxation can be greatly reduced because of the saving of the previous costly annual upkeep of armed forces and armaments; (2) the values of ships and aircraft and munition plants surrendered to the Super State will be insignificant compared to the peace time saving of \$10,000,000,000 each year, and war time saving of \$100,000,000,000 a year; and (3) the credit of each national government (See Sixth Section) will be automatically increased, by the voiding for all time of its obligation to pay the principal of one-tenth of its bonded debt—the proportion of its national bonds surrendered to the Super State.

Explanatory Note FOUR — Proposed Oceanic Island Bases and Territories of the Super State:

What follows is but a tentative suggestion; it proposes thirteen Ocean Island Bases and Territories. Of these, five are in the Atlantic Ocean, five in the Pacific Ocean, and three in the Mediterranean Sea.

In the Atlantic Ocean—(1) Southern Greenland in the North, (2) the Azores in the East, (3) Trinidad and (4) Puerto Rica and (5) Guadalupe Islands in the West.

In the Pacific Ocean—(6) Oahu in Hawaii in the Mid-North, (7) Galipagos Islands in East, (8) Marshall Islands in Mid-West, and (9) Mindanao of the Philippines and (10) Celebes Islands in the West.

In the Mediterranean—(11) Balearic Islands, (12) Malta and (13) Crete.

The nations which now hold title to said islands or

groups of islands shall cede absolute right of ownership of said islands or groups of islands to the Super State, as follows: (1) by Denmark, (2) by Portugal, (3) and (12) by Great Britain (4) and (6) and (9) by the United States, (5) by France, (7) by Ecuador, (8) by Japan, (10) by Holland, (11) by Spain and (13) by Greece.

Explanatory Note FIVE—Efforts Preliminary to the Formation of the Super State:

Since this is a realistic plan, NO action shall be taken by the United States government, actually to organize a Super State *until* the great powers of Europe are so exhausted by war that they are anxious to accept the plan.

But prior to that time, without endangering its peace or lessening its international influence, the United States shall energetically promote the plan. To this end, the individuals and organizations shall awaken our citizens to the realization that nothing but a Super State with power to enforce peace can insure permanent world peace; both private organizations and the United States Government shall publicize to all nations, the ideal of the relationship of the armed power of the United States to its several states; they shall publicize this as the pattern for the relationship of the armed power of a Super State, to its individual member nations; they shall publicize to all people of all nations, the facts that no citizen of any state of the United States has lost any essential rights, because his federal government has absolute control of the armed power of the nation, and that permanent peace between its states has been due to the federal government's possession of such armed power.

During this Preliminary Period, the United States Government shall repeatedly announce to the peoples of other nations, that (1) it will never co-operate in forming any union or league or federation of nations whose basic mode of operation is talk and discussion; and that (2) it will NOT co-operate in promoting or organizing any federation or world union of nations of one ideology only;* and (3) that all its influence and power will be directed to forming a Super State which *shall have power* to enforce world peace.

Explanatory Note SIX—Actual Organization of the Super State:

The United States shall NOT take action to organize a Super State until the time designated by Explanatory Note ONE.

* Any such effort would initiate a new world war more terrible than any war of the past or present.

At such time, the United States shall formally propose that the present SEVEN great powers of the world—Germany, Great Britain and her dominions, France and her colonies, the Italian Empire, the Japanese Empire, Soviet Russia and the United States of America—shall organize a Super State with power to enforce peace.

If, however, the six nations other than the United States, shall not within six months after said proposal, take definite steps to establish such a Super State, then the United States shall secure co-operation of any three or more neutral nations, to the end that the United States* and said co-operating nations shall unite their respective armies and navies and war aircraft, and place said armed forces under control of a Temporary Naval Power Board appointed by the President of the United States.

And said Board shall be given power by said appointment to USE said united armed forces, to stop all shipments of all supplies of ALL kinds into the territories of all nations at war, and to continue said blockade until said warring nations shall agree to the organization of a Super State with power to enforce permanent world peace; and said blockade shall be continued until said nations shall guarantee the fulfillment of their agreement by actual surrender to said Temporary Naval Power Board, of all their respective navies and war aircraft.

Then said Temporary Naval Power Board shall immediately establish itself on an island base, either in the Azores or in Puerto Rico, and said Temporary Naval Power Board shall maintain control over all naval vessels and aircraft surrendered to it, until members of a Supreme Peace Power Council shall have been elected and organized as the Supreme Peace Power Council; at which time said Temporary Naval Power Board shall transfer full control of said navies and aircraft to Supreme Peace Power Council.

Then the Supreme Peace Power Council shall proceed with the organization of the army, navy, and aircraft forces of the Super State, and preparation of its Oceanic Island Bases and Territories.

Explanatory Note SEVEN—Action in Case of Default of Interest Payment:

In case any nation shall at any time default in pay-

* This procedure can be carried out under leadership of the United States, even if at such time, the United States be one of the warring nations.

ment of interest on the portion of its bonds surrendered to the Super State, then the Super State shall have power to supervise the levy and collection of a tax upon the citizens of said individual nation equal to the amount of the interest in default.

Explanatory Note EIGHT—Preservation of Impartiality of the Super State:

That the Supreme Peace Power Council of the Super State shall be free of influence of any nation or group of nations, (1) no resident of Bases or Territories of the Super State shall have any right to vote so long as he resides at said bases or in said territories; and (2) EACH executive member of the Supreme Peace Power Council shall be *chosen for life* by free vote of the citizens of his own nation; and (3) no such elected member shall be removable except by two-thirds vote of the citizens of the country from which said member was chosen, or by a two-thirds vote of the Supreme Peace Power Council; and (4) said Council shall have no power of removal of a member except for personal incapacity, or for treason to the Super State.

Explanatory Note NINE—Prevention of Super State Becoming a Machiavellian Power:

To prevent the possibility of said Super State from becoming a Machiavellian power detrimental to the interests of any one nation or group of nations, (1) the means herein provided for election of members of its Supreme Peace Power Council shall never be changed; and (2) all secrets of processes and materials of chemical warfare and all means of production of all munitions by the Super State shall be controlled by power of the Peace Armament Board; and (3) the Supreme Peace Power Council shall have NO power of control over said Peace Armament Board.

Explanatory Note TEN—National Maintenance of Order and Licenses and Sales to Nations:

When each nation surrenders its arms equipment, it shall be permitted to retain small arms sufficient to equip a national police force equal to not more than 1% of its population; then to maintain such equipment the Super State shall sell at cost to the nation such small arms and ammunition as are necessary for said national police force.

That each nation shall not be hindered in its industrial life and scientific research because of its surrender to the Super State of formulae, processes, designs and inventions, the Super State shall by license, give to each nation, the right to use such formulae, processes, designs or

inventions to the extent needed by the nation for scientific purposes, or for legitimate use in industry and agriculture for the betterment and advancement of its people.

Explanatory Note ELEVEN—Organization of Armed Power of Super State:

Immediately after the Super State shall be organized, it shall establish a center of government in the Azore Islands or in Puerto Rico; and shall immediately proceed to organize its armed force.

The Super State shall at once begin preparation of additional army and navy and aircraft bases at its Oceanic Island Bases.

The ARMY of the Super State shall be composed of soldiers and officers selected from regulars of the present armies, and chosen for exceptional fitness and from lists of those who signify their desire to enlist for life in the work of preserving peace on earth. With the formation of this Super State Army, the Super State's temporary control of all other men of all armies which shall have been surrendered to it, shall be relinquished.

From the personnel of the Navies and Air Corps, surrendered to the Super State, said Super State shall choose as many trained men and officers as it shall deem necessary to man and operate all its navies and war aircraft; all other men nationally enlisted in said services at time of their surrender to the Super State, shall be returned to civilian life in their respective home lands.

All MUNITION PLANTS of all nations surrendered to the Super State shall be operated ONLY by said Super State under absolute control of the Peace Armament Board; all plants necessary for continued production of necessary equipment and munitions SHALL be MOVED to the Oceanic Island Bases of the Super State as soon as said Island Bases can be made ready for such producing plants; and there shall be no delay in the transference of said productive plants because of initial cost of said transfer.

Explanatory Note TWELVE—Economic Rights of Nations:

To lessen age-long unjust conditions which lead to war, the Super State shall have power to prevent the economic starvation of any people of any nation irrespective of the cause of said economic condition; in exercise of this power, the Super State shall have NO power to take source materials or territories from one nation and give them to another; it SHALL have power to enforce the right of any nation of the first part, to purchase raw materials of any nation of a second part, at the same price

and under same conditions as said raw materials are being sold by said nation of the second part to other nations of the world.

Explanatory Note THIRTEEN—Voidance of Causes of War by World Citizenship:

During the Preliminary Period, prior to the organization of the Super State, the United States shall widely publicize to all peoples, that, to establish good will among all peoples, there is the need (1) of a World Citizenship, and (2) the abolishment of national and armed forces stationed at national borders.

It shall be publicized that wars and more wars will follow each other, so long as *each* of 60 or more nations is allowed to maintain an army of its own, ever ready to avenge whatever its national leader may consider to be an insult or injury to any of its citizens, by citizens of another country.

It shall be emphasized that if each of the 48 states of the United States had been allowed to maintain an army of its own, ever armed to revenge insults to its citizens whenever individual friction was created by a citizen crossing a state boundary, we might have had an average of 100 little wars each year, for the last 100 years.

It shall also be emphasized that, with World Citizenship, no nation will need an army to protect its citizens when they journey or permanently move to a foreign country, any more than Connecticut now needs an army to protect its citizens when they journey or move to New York State.

It should be widely publicized that man's desire to fraternize with his fellow man, *is stronger* than his desire to injure others; that even when man is commanded to kill, his love of fellow man persists. The comradeship of soldiers in opposing trenches during the last war, and the eager fraternization today of men in the Siegfried line with those in the Maginot line, is proof that man is ready for World Citizenship! Men *prefer* to fraternize as members of the brotherhood of man, rather than kill each other as prejudiced particularized citizens of any nation.

TALK versus POWER

This tentative plan is opposed to, and makes NO provision for, any federation or league or union of nations, whose power of action resides in a world Assembly or Congress. Such a deliberative body would be composed of representatives of different nations. These representa-

tives would meet to talk to settle international problems by free discussion.

There is a place and time for free and full democratic discussion. All peoples of individual nations have an inalienable right freely to discuss methods and policies of attaining and maintaining human rights and advancing human welfare. There are differences of opinions about policies and methods, and discussion is wise to determine which are best.

But there is NO right to murder, individually or en masse; and hence no need of discussion to determine which are the best policies or methods of murdering.

Each thing or activity produces after its own kind. Talk results in talk; action results in *actuality*.

Nothing but a Super State, with POWER of ACTION to enforce peace, can maintain permanent peace on earth!

With peace maintained by such a Super State, the brotherhood of man will become an actuality—fulfilling the prayer of the wisest, sanest and most practical man who ever lived on earth, whose very birth was heralded by “peace on earth, good will to man!”

For the establishment or maintenance of world peace, this is useless—because NO discussion is needed to determine whether or not it is best for the world to have world peace or world war—devastation and slaughter—every few years.

Moreover, discussion leads to differences, differences to dissension, dissension to breaks between nations and withdrawals from the league or union. Then in sequence—the weakening of the union, dependence on armed opposition, and war. Witness recent history: this is the process, step by step, of what has taken place from the time of the organization of the talking League of Nations in 1920 to the war of 1939.

Any newly organized talking union of nations, will lead to similar results, because the law which determines the results is as old and true as Genesis. Each thing or activity produces after its own kind. Thinking produces thought; visioning produces visions; and talking produces more talk!

AUTHOR OF THE DRAFT

Brown Landone, by birth a citizen of the United States, has lived in England, France, Germany and Italy. He is the Editor-in-Chief of a seven-volume *History of Civilization* of which the associate editors were Edmund Jane James, Daniel Jordan, Lorado Taft, William H. Tolman and John H. Wigmore.

Doctor Landone is author of many books and monographs. During the war of 1914-1918, assisted by Major-General Leonard Wood, he wrote *Awake USA*, and translated into French *The World War*, by permission of the late Theodore Roosevelt. Lay sermons of Dr. Landone have been chosen for "Best Sermons of the Year" and for "My Idea of God" edited by Dr. Joseph Fort Newton.

Doctor Landone is fellow or member of European and American economic and scientific societies. In 1912 and 1913 he supervised an Economic and Financial Survey of the then German Empire. In presenting conclusions of that survey to the Sorbonne in March of 1914, he stated: "The financial condition of the German Empire will compel Germany to make war within six months."

Prior to 1914, Doctor Landone was Director General of the Institute of the Sciences of the Arts in France. In later years, he has re-discovered *The Teleois* of the Canon of Polikleites; written *The Economic Order of the New Adjustment*; *The Prophecies of Melchi-Zedek*; and has lately engaged in publishing work.







